

REMARKS

The Office Action dated January 29, 2010, has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-3, 7-10, 12-22, 25-27, 30-34, 36-46, 50 and 54 are pending and under consideration. By this amendment, claim 54 is added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the Application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in claims 12-17 and 36-41.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 6-10, 25-26, and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,298,441 to Handelsman et al. (hereinafter "Handelsman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,667 to Duga et al. (hereinafter "Duga") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,890,177 to Moody et al. (hereinafter "Moody") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,553,216 to Yoshioka et al. (hereinafter "Yoshioka"). Claims 3 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handelsman in view of Duga in further view of Moody in further view of Yoshioka and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,384 to Block et al. (hereinafter "Block"). Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,761,681 to Huffman et al. (hereinafter "Huffman") in view of Duga in further view of

Handelman in further view of Moody and in further view of Yoshioka. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows.

The Applicants submit that Handelman, Duga, Moody, Yoshioka, Block and Huffman, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for restricting access to electronic books displayed on a viewer, including at least the following combination of features: "displaying the electronic book on the viewer; receiving at the viewer an identification of restricted content from the user; saving an unrestricted version of the electronic book in at least one of the library unit and the viewer, the unrestricted version including the original format of the electronic book; creating a restricted version of the electronic book and saving the restricted version of the electronic book in at least one of the library unit and the viewer, wherein the restricted version includes the unrestricted version of the election book with portions of the unrestricted version deleted, wherein the deletions are based on the identification of restricted content from the user; and inserting a cross-reference to the restricted version of the electronic book in a header portion of the unrestricted version of the electronic book," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action, on pages 2-3 and 5, asserts that Handelman discloses "creating a restricted version of the electronic book and saving the restricted version of the electronic book . . . wherein the restricted version includes the unrestricted version of the electronic book with portions of the unrestricted version deleted," citing to col. 17, lines 27-39 and col. 18, lines 24-39 of Handelman. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Handelman, in col. 17, lines 27-39 and col. 18, lines 30-36, discloses that “conditional access information stored in the information smart card 385 comprises parental control information, controlling which portions or which version of all or a portion of the document may be displayed. In such a case, the document 405 is typically received in several versions, each version preferably being encrypted in accordance with at least one parameter.” Handelman, however, does not disclose or suggest “saving the restricted version of the electronic book in at least one of the library unit and the viewer, wherein the restricted version includes the unrestricted version of the election book with portions of the unrestricted version deleted,” as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Handelman discloses “controlling which portions or which version of all or a portion of the document [that] may be displayed.” Controlling which portions of a document that may be displayed may not be interpreted as disclosing or suggesting “saving the restricted version of the electronic book . . . wherein the restricted version includes the unrestricted version of the electronic book with portions of the unrestricted version deleted,” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added). Moreover, receiving several versions of a document, as disclosed by Handelman, may not be interpreted as disclosing or suggesting that the different versions of the document include “the unrestricted version of the electronic book with portions of the unrestricted version deleted,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above combination of reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination. For similar reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 10, 25, 34 and 50 are also allowable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

As claims 1, 10, 25, 34 and 50 are allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 2-3, 7-9, 26-27, and 30-33, which depend from claims 1 and 25, respectively, are likewise allowable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

New Claim

The Applicants have added new claim 54 to recite subject matter to which they are entitled. Claim 54 is allowable as there is no combination of the cited references that discloses or suggests the features recited by this claim.

In particular, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for restricting access to electronic books displayed on a viewer, including at least the following combination of features: "saving an unrestricted version of the electronic book in at least one of the library unit and the viewer, the unrestricted version including the original format of the electronic book; creating a restricted version of the electronic book and saving the restricted version of the electronic book in at least one of the library unit and the viewer, wherein the restricted version includes the unrestricted version of the election book with portions of the unrestricted version deleted, wherein the deletions are based on the identification of restricted content from the user; and wherein the header portion for each electronic book identifies whether the corresponding electronic book is the unrestricted version of the electronic book or the restricted version of the electronic book," as recited in claim 54.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claim 54.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant(s) respectfully petition(s) for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 026880-00029.**

Respectfully submitted,



Tiffany J. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 57,912

Customer No. 004372

ARENT FOX LLP

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036-5339

Tel: (202) 857-6000

Fax: (202) 638-4810

TJB/ayw

Enclosure(s): Petition for Extension of Time (1-month)
Request for Continued Examination (RCE)